

Higgs Mass from Casimir Energy Induced Cosmological Constant in the Standard Model

Xiao-Gang He

Department of Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan

Abstract

Casimir vacuum energy is divergent. It needs to be regularized. The regularization introduces a renormalization scale which may lead to a scale dependent cosmological constant. We show that the requirement of physical cosmological constant is renormalization scale independent provides important constraints on possible particle contents and their masses in particle physics models. In the Standard Model of strong and electroweak interactions, besides the Casimir vacuum energy there is also vacuum energy induced from spontaneous symmetry breaking. The requirement that the total vacuum energy to be scale independent dictates the Higgs mass to be $m_H^4 = 8 \sum_i N_i m_i^4 - 12m_W^4 - 6m_Z^4$, where the summation is over fermions and N_i equals to 3 and 1 for quarks and leptons, respectively. The Higgs mass is predicted to be approximately 382 GeV.

PACS numbers:

Recent data from Type Ia supernovae indicate that our universe is in an accelerating expansion phase [1]. Accelerating expansion implies the existence of energy form(s) (dark energy) with equation of state parameter $\omega = (\text{pressure density}/\text{energy density})$ to be less than $-1/3$. The cosmological constant Λ , with $\omega = -1$, is one of the leading candidates for the dark energy. Combining information from Cosmic Microwave Background radiation, cluster survey and other data, the energy density provided by the cosmological constant relative to the critical energy density is determined to be approximately 65% [2]. Implications for a universe with cosmological constant have been extensively studied [3,4]. The cosmological constant Λ is related to the physical vacuum energy density ρ_p by $\Lambda = 8\pi G_N \rho_p$.

At present there are no convincing theoretical models which can produce the observed size of the cosmological constant. This is one of the most prominent problems in cosmology and particle physics [4]. There are several discussions about constraints on properties of the Standard Model (SM) of the strong and electroweak interactions from vacuum energy. Most of them tried to estimate the size of the cosmological constant and how it changes with energies [6,7,8]. There are also several quantum field theoretical studies of the vacuum energy renormalization properties [5]. In this paper we will not attempt to solve the cosmological problem, except to say that whatever mechanism producing the physical cosmological constant, it must have a value which agrees with observation. Instead we will consider possible constraints on particle physics model parameters, such as particle contents and particle masses using the fact that the physical cosmological constant, being a physical parameter, must be renormalization scale independent. We show that this simple requirement can provide important insight about a long standing problem for particle physics, the Higgs mass in the Standard Model.

In quantum field theory, there are loop corrections to the vacuum energy which are some times divergent such as the contribution from the Casimir vacuum energy (vacuum energy due to particle fluctuation in the background), and the induced vacuum energy from spontaneous symmetry breaking. The divergent part of the vacuum energy must be renormalized to have physical meaning for quantum corrections. Renormalization in general

introduces renormalization scale dependent vacuum energy. The cosmological constant being physical observable must not depend on the renormalization scale.

The Standard Model based on the gauge group $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ is a very successful theory. Many of its properties have been studied and verified experimentally, but one of the most important particle of the model, the Higgs particle, has yet to be discovered. Present experimental lower bound on the Higgs mass is 114 GeV [9]. Electroweak precision data prefers a light Higgs mass around the present lower limit [10]. But larger mass up to several hundred GeV is allowed. There are also some bounds from various theoretical considerations [11]. It is important if the Higgs mass can be constrained or determined from some processes. We find that the Higgs mass in the SM can indeed be constrained from the requirement that the total vacuum energy from Casimir vacuum energy and induced vacuum energy from spontaneous symmetry breaking to be independent of the renormalization scale. We find that in the SM the Higgs mass must be close to 382 GeV. Higgs mass as low as 382 GeV can be studied at the CERN Large Hadron Collider (LHC). The prediction will be tested.

We now provide more details on how information on Higgs mass can be obtained from the study of vacuum energy in the Standard Model. We will first discuss the renormalization scale dependence of Casimir vacuum energy and then discuss the scale dependence of vacuum energy in the SM, and the implications for the Higgs boson mass. The Casimir vacuum energy density produced by one degree of freedom of a massive boson particle is given by

$$\rho_C = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \sqrt{k^2 + m^2}. \quad (1)$$

It is clear that ρ_C is divergent which must be regularized. To regularize the divergent part in this integral, we use a dimensional regularization by changing the integral to $n = 3 - 2\epsilon$ with ϵ to be taken to zero at the end [8]

$$\rho_C = \frac{\mu_0^{2\epsilon}}{4\pi^2} \int k^{1-2\epsilon} dk^2 \sqrt{k^2 + m^2}. \quad (2)$$

Here the μ_0 parameter is introduced to make sure that the dimension of the integral is the same as in eq.(1). We have

$$\rho_C = -\frac{m^4}{64\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} + 2 \ln 2 - \frac{1}{2} + \ln \frac{\mu^2}{m^2} \right) + \frac{m^4}{32\pi^2} \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\mu_0^2}. \quad (3)$$

The first term in the above is to be renormalized away. The second term is μ_0 dependent. One should also note that in the above prescription the vacuum energy density of a zero mass particle has been normalized to be zero.

From this procedure it is not possible to fix the value of the total vacuum energy produced because the bare vacuum energy density is unknown, any value can be obtained. As have been mentioned that in this paper we will not attempt to determine the value of the net cosmological constant, but to study possible constraints on particle physics model parameters by requiring that the physical vacuum energy must be μ_0 independent.

For a given theory there are more than one particle degrees of freedom. The total Casimir vacuum energy density is the sum of contributions from all particles. When summing over all particle contributions, one should multiply a “minus” sign for the contribution from a fermion particle degree of freedom because the anti-commuting nature of fermions. One has

$$\rho_C^{eff} = \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \ln \frac{\mu_0^2}{\mu^2} \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{i=fermions} m_i^4 - \sum_{i=bosons} m_i^4 \right). \quad (4)$$

In the above we have removed the part which is not μ_0 dependent and have referred to the remaining vacuum energy as ρ_C^{eff} . It is clear that if a theory only has boson or fermion degree of freedom, it is not possible to have a scale μ_0 independent ρ_C^{eff} . However when appropriate fermion and boson degrees of freedom appear in the theory, cancellations can happen such that the net cosmological constant produced by the Casimir vacuum energy is scale μ_0 independent.

If the universe is supersymmetric, the above effective energy density ρ_C^{eff} is automatically zero, therefore the total cosmological constant, is scale independent because in supersymmetric theories there are equal numbers of fermion and boson degrees of freedom, and each bosonic particle and its fermionic supersymmetric partner have the same mass. In fact this not only makes the cosmological constant scale independent, it also dictates the cosmological constant to be exactly zero. However, supersymmetry is known to be broken, scale

dependence will be introduced by supersymmetry breaking effect in general unless there are certain relations between mass spectrum in a given model to facilitate the cancellation.

Without supersymmetry, elimination of the scale dependence of the cosmological constant is also possible if there are relations between particle masses and have the right number of degrees of freedom. In the SM, the particle contents are fixed. Cancellation of the scale dependence can only be caused by relation between the particle masses. In the SM, ρ_C^{eff} is given by

$$\rho_C^{eff} = \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\mu_0^2} \frac{1}{2} (m_H^4 + 6m_W^4 + 3m_Z^4 - 4 \sum_i N_i m_i^4), \quad (5)$$

where the summation is over the SM fermions with N_i being 3 and 1 for quarks and charged leptons, respectively. For neutrinos depending on whether they are massive Dirac particles or Majorana particles, $N_i = 1$ or $N_i = 1/2$. If the above is the only contribution to the total vacuum energy, the elimination of the dependence on μ requires the existence of a mass relation between the Higgs boson mass and the other known particle masses. We obtain

$$m_H^4 = 12m_t^4 - 6m_W^4 - 3m_Z^4 + O(m_b^4, \dots), \quad (6)$$

It is interesting to see that the above provides a way to determine the Higgs mass which is otherwise unknown in the SM. Using the known values [12] $m_Z = 91.2$ GeV, $m_W = 80.4$ GeV, and $m_t = 174.3$ GeV, the Higgs particle should have a mass about 321 GeV.

One can apply the formula to the Two Higgs doublet model. In that case there are five physical Higgs bosons. One would obtain

$$\sum_{i=1,2,3,4,5} m_{H_i}^4 = 12m_t^4 - 6m_W^4 - 3m_Z^4 + O(m_b^4, \dots), \quad (7)$$

From the above one finds that at least one of the Higgs boson must have a mass less than 215 GeV.

The effective Casimir vacuum energy obtained in eq. (1) can be generalized to models beyond the SM with more particles and with different gauge groups. However the predictive power for the Higgs mass will be less if the new particle masses introduced are not known.

The above predictions are based on the assumption that the Casimir vacuum energy is the only source for vacuum energy. However in the SM there are additional source contributing to the vacuum energy through spontaneous symmetry breaking due to Higgs field condensation. The Higgs potential in the SM is given by

$$V(H) = V_{vac-bare} + \mu^2 H^\dagger H + \frac{1}{2}\lambda(H^\dagger H)^2. \quad (8)$$

Here $H^\dagger = (v + H^0, \sqrt{2}H^+)/\sqrt{2}$ is the Higgs doublet in the SM. The non-zero vacuum expectation value v breaks the $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ to $U(1)_{em}$. The term $V_{vac-bare}$ is a constant (no scale dependence) representing the bare vacuum energy which can be used to renormalize any divergent vacuum energy generated at loop level. After spontaneous electroweak symmetry breaking, one obtains a vacuum energy given by

$$\langle V \rangle = V_{vac-bare} - \frac{m_H^4}{8\lambda}. \quad (9)$$

The imaginary part of H^0 and H^+ are “eaten” by the Z and W bosons, and the real part of H^0 becomes massive with a mass m_H given by $m_H^2 = \lambda v^2$. $\langle V \rangle$ is the classic physical vacuum energy.

When quantum corrections are included, there are additional contributions at loop level. There are two types of quantum corrections. One is the Casimir vacuum energy discussed earlier. This vacuum energy can be viewed as quantum fluctuation with closed boson and fermion loops in the vacuum which adds to $\langle V \rangle$ an additional term V_{loop} . The other is quantum corrections to the Higgs mass m_H and the coupling λ . These corrections are divergent and need regularization. This leads to a renormalization μ scale dependent cosmological constant. One needs to find the conditions that can make the physical vacuum energy to be renormalization scale μ independent. To this end we have evaluated the β function of the vacuum energy. We have

$$(4\pi)^2 \mu \frac{\partial \langle V \rangle}{\partial \mu} = (4\pi)^2 \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} (V_{loop} - \frac{m_H^4}{8\lambda}) = \frac{1}{2}m_H^4 + 6m_W^2 + 3m_Z^4 - 4 \sum_i N_i m_i^4. \quad (10)$$

In obtaining the above equation we have used [6]

$$\begin{aligned}
(4\pi)^2 \mu \frac{\partial V_{loop}}{\partial \mu} &= \frac{1}{2} m_H^4 + 3m_W^4 + \frac{3}{2} m_Z^4 - 2 \sum_i N_i m_i^4, \\
(4\pi)^2 \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \left(-\frac{m_H^4}{8\lambda} \right) &= (4\pi)^2 \mu \left(-\frac{m_H^2}{4\lambda} \frac{\partial m_H^2}{\partial \mu} + \frac{m_H^4}{8\lambda^2} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \mu} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
(4\pi)^2 \mu \frac{\partial m_H^2}{\partial \mu} &= m_H^2 \left(6\lambda - \frac{9}{2} g^2 - \frac{3}{2} g'^2 + 2 \sum_i N_i h_i^2 \right) \\
(4\pi)^2 \mu \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \mu} &= 12\lambda^2 - 9\lambda g^2 - 3\lambda g'^2 + \frac{9}{4} g^4 + \frac{3}{2} g^2 g'^2 + \frac{3}{4} g'^4 + 4 \sum_i N_i h_i^2 (\lambda - h_i^2),
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where g , g' and h_i are the $SU(2)_L$, $U(1)_Y$ and the Yukawa couplings, respectively. The particle masses are given by $m_W^2 = g^2 v^2/4$, $m_Z^2 = (g^2 + g'^2)v^2/4$ and fermion masses $m_i = h_i v/\sqrt{2}$.

If the right hand side of eq. (10) does not vanish, the total vacuum energy density $\langle V \rangle$ depends on the scale μ . In order to have a $\langle V \rangle$ independent of the scale, one must demand

$$m_H^4 = 8 \sum_i N_i m_i^4 - 12m_W^4 - 6m_Z^4 \tag{13}$$

One notes that the right hand side of the above equation is twice that of eq. (6). Therefore the Higgs mass determined from the above equation is larger by a factor of $2^{1/4}$. The use of eq. (6) is not complete. We predict that the Higgs mass in the SM must be around

$$m_H \approx 382 \text{ GeV}. \tag{14}$$

The Higgs mass determined this way is more than a factor of three larger than the present lower bound, but is within the reach of LHC. The prediction can be tested in the near future.

The above result is obtained at the one loop level. There are higher order loop corrections. These corrections will shift the predicted value for the Higgs mass, but the change will be small. The Higgs mass is therefore expected to be around 382 GeV.

There is also the possibility that the bare vacuum energy $V_{vac-bare}$ used to renormalize the divergent part also depends on the scale such that this scale dependence cancels exactly the one due to loop corrections discussed in the above [5]. In that case there is no information

about Higgs mass can be obtained. At present, we do not see how this can occur in the Standard Model by directly evaluating the known contributions to the beta function. The approach taking here is to force the known beta function to be zero without adding new terms in the Lagrangian. Further study to understand the vacuum energy renormalization properties are necessary. At the phenomenological level, the approach taking here is, in some way, to require that the theory should not have quartic divergences which is similar in spirit to some of the studies in Ref. [11] to constraint particle masses by requiring certain divergences to vanish.

One can apply the method to extensions of the SM. The generalization of the Casimir vacuum energy part is trivial. One just needs to specify the particle contents and their masses. The scale dependence of the induced vacuum energy part, terms of the form $-m_H^4/8\lambda$, is however model dependent. One needs more information about the model parameters to obtain detailed numerical numbers for the Higgs mass or any other parameters. Nevertheless, the requirement of the total vacuum energy to be scale independent still provides an important constraint on models.

In conclusion, we have shown that constraints on particle physics model parameter can be obtained from the requirement of the physical vacuum energy to be renormalization scale independent. In the Standard Model this simple requirement predicts that the Higgs mass is approximately 382 GeV. This prediction can be tested in the near future at LHC. Confirmation of this prediction will provide important information about the Higgs mechanism in the Standard Model for strong and electroweak interactions, it may also provide an important clue to solve the cosmological constant problem.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by National Science Council under grants NSC 91-2112-M-002-42, and in part by the Ministry of Education Academic Excellence Project 89-N-FA01-1-4-3.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Perlmutter et al., *Nature* **391**, 51(1998); *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565(1999); A. Riess et al., *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009(1998); A. Riess et al., e-print astro-ph/0104455.
- [2] See for example M. Signore and D. Puy, e-print astro-ph/0108515, *AIP Conf.* 616:338(2002); J. Sievers et al., e-print astro-ph/0205387.
- [3] S.M. Carroll, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 3067(1998); J. Barrow, R. Bean and J. Magueijo, *Mon. Not. Astron. Soc.* 316, L41-4(2000); A. Albrecht and C. Skordis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2076(2000); T.-H. Chiueh and X.-G. He, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 123518(2002); X.-G. He, e-print astro-ph/0105005; S. Hellerman, N. Kaloper and L. Susskid, **JHEP** 0106:003, 2001; W. Fischler et al., **JHEP** 0107:003, 2001.
- [4] S. Weinberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61**, 1(1989); S. Carroll, *Living Rev. Rel.* **4**, 1(2001).
- [5] S. Odintsov and E.Elizalde, *Phys. Lett.* **B303**, 240(1993); **B321**, 199(1994); E.Elizalde et al, *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, 2202(1995); I. Brevik, S.Odintsov and L. Granda, *Phys. Lett.* **B367**, 206(1996).
- [6] I. Shapiro and J. Sola, **JHEP** 0202:006, 2002; *Phys. Lett.* **B475**, 236(2000).
- [7] A. Babic et al., *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 085002(2002).
- [8] I. Cherednikov, e-print astro-ph/0111287; *Acta. Phys. Polon.* **B33**, 1973(2002).
- [9] LEP Higgs working group, CERN0EP/2001-055.
- [10] See for example, M. Chanowitz, *Phys. Rev.* **D66**, 073001(2002)
- [11] M. Veltman, *Acta. Phys. Polon.* **B12**, 437(1981); P. Olsland and T. T. Wu, *Phys. Lett.* **B291**, 315(1992); C. Newton and T. T. Wu, *Z. Phys.* **C62**, 253(1994); E. Ma, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A16**, 3099(2001); *Phys. Rev.* **D47**, 2143(1993); Y. Nambu, EFI-90-37-CHICAGO, Published in Rochester: 40 Years 1990:0001-12. M. Lindner, M. Sher and H. Zaglauer, *Phys. Lett.* **B228**, 139(1989); A. Casas, J. Espinosa and M. Quiros, *Phys. Lett.* **B342**,

171(1995).

[12] Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 010001(2002).